

**Woodburn 5th Street Improvements Project
Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #2
January 28, 2010**

Committee Members present

Cindy Wurdinger-Kelly
Tom Lonerger
Mario Magana
Caroline Sanchez-Ruiz
Ed Krupicka
Christine Vistica
Tom Welch
Jaime Estrada

Dave Christoff
Jerry Ambris
Peppi Kosikowski
Robert Carney
Casey Robles
Paul Iverson
Jessy Olsen
Laura E. Isiordia

Committee Members absent

Myrna Wagner
Barbara Jean Burt
Linda Wilmes-Smith
Shawn Baird

Staff

Dan Brown, *City of Woodburn Public Works Director*
Eric Liljequist, *City of Woodburn*
Duane Barrick, *City of Woodburn*
Marta Carrillo, *City of Woodburn*
Kevin Thelin, *Murray, Smith & Associates, Inc.*
Gabe Crop, *Murray, Smith & Associates, Inc.*
Eryn Deeming Kehe, *JLA Public Involvement*
Sam Beresky, *JLA Public Involvement*

Eleven members of the public attended this meeting.

Welcome and Introductions

Eryn Deeming Kehe welcomed the group, reviewed use and purpose of the “decision cards” and reviewed the agenda. The main purpose of the meeting was to review the comment/response log, concerns and questions, review the list of project alternatives, hear staff perspective and to receive preliminary feedback from the CAC. Staff, the public and CAC members introduced themselves.

The CAC approved the Meeting #1 Summary.

Eryn reviewed the walking tour that took place on January 23, 2010. She said approximately 20 people participated in the walk of the project area. Flags were placed along the right-of-way (ROW) for CAC members and the public to get a better idea of the ROW dimensions. Six foot wide plastic sheeting to represent sidewalk was laid out for participants to gauge potential

sidewalk width. On the tour, the group discussed the need for the design to fit the environment and noticed the narrowing of 5th Street to the north, closer to the barrier.

The public was notified of the Walking Tour through a postcard sent January 14th sent to every address within a 250-foot radius of the project area. The tour announcement was also posted on the project website and in the St. Luke's parish bulletin.

Review Comment/Response Log

Gabe Crop let the committee know that the project team will continue to review comments from the Open Houses and will add comments from the committee and the public from each CAC meeting. Eryn mentioned that the comment log is meant to be a register of comments the project team has heard throughout the project. She said that comments can also be emailed directly to Eric Liljequist at the City of Woodburn at eric.liljequist@ci.woodburn.or.us or by phone by calling 503-982-5241.

Preliminary Alternatives (*CAC and Public Questions appear in italics*)

Transportation System Plan (TSP) Review:

Gabe gave a brief review of the excerpt (Chapter 5) from the Transportation System Plan (TSP) provided in each packet to CAC members. The entire TSP can be found on the city website. The TSP concludes with the recommendation that the series of projects defined as Alternative 2 be completed.

What were the criteria for selecting Alternative 2 in the TSP?

Dan Brown responded and said that the adoption of the TSP was the result of a separate public process with final adoption by the Woodburn City Council. It was adopted in 2005 with Alternative 2 providing an improved level of connectivity for Woodburn and access across 214.

Have any of the projects in Alternative 2 in the TSP been completed?

Dan Brown said there is a current backlog of TSP projects because of a lack of funding. The 5th Street Improvements rose to the top of the TSP due to state funding for the widening of 214. Ideally, the 5th Street Improvements should be completed prior to the 214 improvements.

If the city does not improve 5th Street, could they get fined by ODOT?

No, but already allocated federal and state dollars are being spent to explore widening Hwy 214 assuming 5th Street is opened per the TSP. The lack of follow through by the City could have ramifications if it ended up not being opened.

Who will be paying for the Hwy 214 project?

ODOT and Federal dollars will be spent to widen 214 and these plans could be compromised or changed if 5th street is not opened.

Traffic Information:

Gabe gave a brief overview of the traffic flow analysis, including current traffic counts (hand out). The project team is planning to return at the next meeting with the results of the traffic modeling so the CAC will be able to compare the current traffic counts with the estimates for the area in the future. Availability of the results depends on how quickly ODOT (“owner” of the model) is able to complete the model run.

Preliminary Alternatives:

Gabe gave a short overview of 5th Street Alternatives 1a and 1b:

- Alternative 1a: Two-way traffic option on 5th Street, with 5th street connected to Hwy 214.
- Alternative 1b: Two-way traffic option on 5th Street same as Alternative 1A plus the Yew Street extension between 3rd and 5th streets.

In regards to cross-section A-A, if there was a 4-foot sidewalk instead of a 6-foot sidewalk, the traffic lanes could be 12 feet instead of 11 feet.

Yes, there is some flexibility on the width of elements like this. As things vary from the City’s standard they need to be approved on a case-by-case basis.

Would the trees along the side of St. Luke’s survive?

As currently drawn, the intent would be to save the trees. However, an arborist would be consulted to determine if damage to the root system would occur during and after construction.

Should the lanes be a consistent width along the length of the street?

Ideally, yes. There are instances that could lead to exceptions of this, however, such as a existing features determined to be essential to keep.

Gabe gave a short overview of Alternative 2a and 2b:

- Alternative 2: Couplet option. 5th Street and 3rd would become one-way streets in opposite directions.
 - Alternative 2a: Counterclockwise movement of traffic.
 - Alternative 2b: Clockwise movement of traffic.
 - Alternatives 2a and 2b would require the Yew Street extension, but may allow for construction of a narrower street.

Clockwise motion makes the most sense because of the connection at Harrison.

Would Harrison remain a 2-way street?

Yes.

It seems that any one-way option would increase traffic, as any resident on either 3rd or 5th will have to complete the entire loop each time they leave or return home.

Event traffic at St. Luke’s should be accounted for. A one-way street does not make sense when event traffic is considered.

Both school busses and public busses need to be considered.

The current drop-off and pick-up rotation at St. Luke's has drivers entering off of 5th Street and exiting on 3rd Street.

School busses currently have a difficult time turning the corner onto 5th from Harrison.

How many parking spaces will be provided near the school with Alternative 2? (Cross Section E-E)

The number of spaces will be approximately as shown on Figure 2, although a few of the spaces shown will likely be removed to allow for better turning movements.

Will the sidewalk continue on 5th street all the way to 214?

Yes.

Why will there be a sidewalk and parking provided on Yew Street if no-one lives on that street?

For connectivity and access.

Yew Street Extension:

Gabe gave a brief description of the Yew Street Connection Options and the other 5th to 3rd connection options.

The intent of the Green Option (#4) was to align it along the properties adjacent to Nuevo Amanecer not on the parking of Nuevo Amanecer. It could be eventually connected all the way to 1st.

With any Yew Street connection, Yew should be extended east to 1st to make an easy connection to downtown Woodburn.

An extension of Yew St. to 1st Street is not currently planned as part of this project and is not part of the TSP. Such an extension would not be connected to 1st because there is an already planned and approved housing development between 1st and 2nd Streets.

It seems that any option will put more traffic on 3rd and 5th and subsequently Harrison.

The project team will have the modeling numbers at the next CAC meeting so the group will have a better understanding of potential traffic numbers.

The city wants to put a traffic signal at 5th so it does not matter which alternative we select, the city will complete what it wants regardless of our desires.

If that were the case, the city hopes to receive feedback to help ensure that the proposed project is the best possible option for all. Recall that there is a “no build” option that is being considered along with the other options.

If the city goes ahead with the 5th Street Improvements, would the traffic signal at 214 not be completed until ODOT widens the highway?

If the project moves ahead and traffic signal warrants are met, the city could construct a traffic signal at the intersection prior to the widening of 214.

The pros and cons are outlined for each of the options; the pros and cons should be outlined for the entire project.

One purpose for the dot exercise that is next on the agenda, is to begin the process of creating just such a list.

Who will be traveling, coming to and from where, along the new 5th Street Improvements?

The project will provide improved access and options from the surrounding neighborhood to and from 214 as well as improved options and access to downtown for those than do not live in the neighborhood.

Will it provide improved access to downtown for non-residents as well?

Yes.

The Green and Yellow options would be very expensive for property acquisition and road building. Taking any portion of property of the Woodburn Community Church of Christ could negatively impact the entire property causing a complete relocation. The Church could not function without the parking lot and there are plans to use the back corner field as a playground, ballpark or food bank.

Making a connection as far east as possible makes the most sense from a connectivity and emergency access standpoint.

Currently there is so little traffic on 5th and 3rd Streets that these are safe streets for children so any option will eliminate space for children. As a possible mitigation, the project could also pay for a playground on the Woodburn Community Church of Christ property.

Eric gave a brief description of how the Pedestrian Bridge option does not address the connectivity goals of the project. Eryn gave voting instructions to the CAC (**Red Card:** Against, **Yellow Card:** Reservations, **Green Card:** Yes).

The group voted unanimously to remove the Pedestrian Bridge option.

Eric gave a brief description of why staff recommended the removal of the Green, Orange and Revised Green options. They do not improve the connectivity, are prohibitively cost due to property acquisition, have environmental justice issues in routing a street near low-income housing and the loss of potential community uses of the Church of Christ property. There was a vote to remove the options from consideration. There were **6 Red Cards**, **2 Yellow Cards** and the rest **Green**. CAC members expressed that they should vote on removing one option at a time.

Vote to remove the Green option included **4 Red Cards**. CAC reasons for Red Cards included:

- All the justification for removal of these options are applicable to the project as a whole
- Many CAC members felt that it is too early to remove an option and that it should be analyzed further

Vote to remove the Revised Green option (adjacent to Nuevo Amanecer, not **on** the Nuevo Amanecer property) included **6 Yellow Cards** and **1 Red card**. CAC reasons for Red and Yellow Cards included:

- Would like to see more data on crime and connectivity
- Many CAC members expressed concern that more information is needed - future traffic numbers and fire/emergency access concerns

Vote to remove the Orange option included **1 Yellow Card** and **1 Red Card**. CAC reasons for Red and Yellow Cards included:

- More time is needed for a decision
- Not comfortable eliminating an option this early in the process, it needs to be analyzed further

Eric let the group know that due to time constraints, the project team will need to move forward soon. The CAC will need to make some difficult decisions in future meetings. He invited members to write letters that outline their concerns. The letters would be entered into the official project record.

Public Comment

A member of the public expressed concern about the effect of the project on her parent's property on Yew. They recently spent more than \$40,000 on remodeling and don't want the project to negatively impact their improvements.

A member of the public expressed a concern for safety, speed and cut-through traffic. There was extra concern expressed about potential increased speeds on the one-way options.

Eric responded and mentioned that there would be school zone signs and traffic calming measures instituted that would reduce speeds with any option. Also, Safe Routes to Schools designs would be incorporated into any option.

There was a concern expressed about potential commuter cut-through traffic, not just local traffic that would negatively impact the neighborhood.

A member of the public mentioned that he has lived in Woodburn for more than 40 years and does not see a need for the project at all.

Ranking Key Design Factors Dot Exercise

Each committee member was provided with 10 dots to place on a large printout of key project factors. Committee members were allowed to place more than one dot on any particular factor in order to show the relative importance of each factor to the CAC as a whole. The design team will tally the results and show at the next meeting how well/poorly the proposed alternatives address the factors based on the "scoring". Results were:

26 – Traffic Congestion

18 – Vehicle Access

- 15 – Emergency Response Access
- 14 – Private Property Impacts
- 13 – Parking
- 12 – Pedestrian Safety
- 11 – Noise
- 10 – Crime
- 9 – Property Value
- 9 – Vehicle Speed
- 9 – Yew Street Connection
- 8 – Air Quality
- 4 – Street Lighting
- 4 – Temporary Construction Impacts
- 3 – Pedestrian Facilities
- 3 – Preservation of Existing Features Within Public Right-of-Way
- 1 – Stormwater Management
- 1 – Bicycle Access
- 0 – Transit Access
- 0 – Utility Impacts
- 0 – Landscaping
- 0 – Project Cost



Landscaping	Em
Stormwater Management •	Acc
Utility Impacts	
Street Lighting ••••	
Temporary Construction •••	
Impacts	
Bicycle Access •	
Transit Access	

3

Emergency Response
Access ••••••••••

4

Wrap Up

Eryn thanked the group for attending, reminded them of the next meeting on February 18.